

REMARKS

Claims 10-29 remain in this application. Claims 1-9 have been canceled. Claims 10-29 have been added.

Before responding to the Examiner's rejections in view of the prior art, a brief description of the present application is provided. The present invention provides a method and system that efficiently translates a first domain name into a second domain name. The first domain name comprises a thirdlevel component, a secondlevel component, and a toplevel component. The second domain name comprises a first subdomain name and a client directory. The first subdomain name of the second domain name is determined by: (1) the secondlevel component of the first domain name; (2) the toplevel component of the first domain name; and (3) a second subdomain name having a wildcard. The client directory is determined by the thirdlevel component.

Claims 1-9 are rejected under various prior art grounds. In order to expedite allowance, the rejected claims are being canceled herein, without disclaimer and without prejudice. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that these rejections are now moot.

New Claims 10-29 have been added to clarify certain features of the subject matter being claimed. The limitations in these new claims are not disclosed in or suggested by the cited references currently used to reject Claims 1-9 (whether alone or in combination). That is, the cited references do not disclose or suggest the "translation" of a first domain name (comprising a thirdlevel component, a secondlevel component, and a toplevel component) into a second domain name (having a first subdomain name and a client directory). More specifically, with regard to independent Claim 10, the Applicants respectfully submit that this claim is patentable for at least the reason that it contains the limitations of:

a name assignment system for assigning the first domain name, wherein **the first domain name comprises a**

thirdlevel component, a secondlevel component, and a toplevel component;

a domain name server for resolving . . . **the secondlevel component and the toplevel component into a first computer address; and**

a domain retrieval system associated with the first computer address, wherein the domain retrieval system comprises a scheduler and a plurality of redirectors, wherein the scheduler load balances the plurality of redirectors, wherein each of the plurality of redirectors includes a parsing mechanism, the parsing mechanism being capable of translating the first domain name into a first subdomain name and a client directory, wherein the first subdomain name is translated from a second subdomain name having a wildcard, wherein the first subdomain name is determined by substituting the secondlevel and toplevel components of the first domain name for the wildcard of the second subdomain name, and wherein the client directory is determined by the thirdlevel component of the first domain name. (Emphasis in bold added)

Independent Claim 25 should be independently allowable because it recites:

requesting a first domain name by a user . . . ;

identifying a first computer address . . . determined by the secondlevel component and the toplevel component of the first domain name;

executing a parsing procedure, wherein **the first domain name is translated into a first subdomain name and a client directory, wherein the first subdomain name is translated from a second subdomain name having a wildcard, wherein the first subdomain name is determined by substituting the secondlevel and toplevel components of the first domain name for the wildcard of the second subdomain name, and wherein the client directory is determined by the thirdlevel component of the first domain name;**

identifying a second computer address, wherein the second computer address identifies the first subdomain name; and

transmitting data associated with the second computer address to the user (Emphasis in bold added).

Claims 11-24 and 26-29 should be allowable for at least the reason that they depend from allowable respective base Claims 10 and 25. In addition, for example, the references fail to disclose or suggest "wherein the secondlevel component of the first domain name is a provider domain name and the thirdlevel component of the first domain name is a site name of a client," as defined by Claim 13. Likewise, the cited references fail to disclose or suggest "wherein the domain name server further resolves the first subdomain name and the client directory into a second computer address and wherein at least one of the plurality of redirectors transmits an empty frameset to the user computer," as defined by Claim 15, or "wherein a name assignment system assigns the thirdlevel component of the first domain name based on a selection by a client, assigns the secondlevel component of the first domain name based on a site name of a provider computer, and assigns the toplevel component of the first domain name based on an Internet address standard," as defined by Claim 26.

The support for the new claims can be found at least in the disclosure in pages 11-14; Figs. 4-7; and Claims 1-9 (especially, Claims 8 and 9).

In view of the foregoing, the Applicants respectfully submit that Claims 10-29 are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections is respectfully requested, and a timely Notice of Allowability is solicited. To the extent it would be helpful to placing this application in condition for allowance, the Applicants encourage the Examiner to contact the undersigned counsel and conduct a telephonic interview.

Serial No. 09/386,529
January 27, 2003
Page 10

While the Applicants believe that no fees are due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge any shortage in the fees, including extension of time fees, to Deposit Account No. 50-0639.

Respectfully submitted,



Date: January 27, 2003

Brian M. Berliner
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 34,549

O'MELVENY & MYERS LLP
400 South Hope Street
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2899
Telephone: (213) 430-6000